

**PATENT APPLICATION**  
**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of

Docket No: Q80097

Shin-ichi UEHARA, et al.

Appln. No.: 10/787,128

Group Art Unit: 2872

Confirmation No.: 4671

Examiner: Audrey Y. CHANG, Ph.D.

Filed: February 27, 2004

For: THREE-DIMENSIONAL IMAGE DISPLAY DEVICE PORTABLE TERMINAL  
DEVICE, AND LENTICULAR LENS

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the telephone conference conducted on November 13, 2006:

**REMARKS**

A telephonic conference was conducted on July 5, 2005 between Examiner Audrey Y. Chang, of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and Applicant's representative, Andrew J. Taska.

The purpose of the interview was to discuss the Examiner's failure to acknowledge the Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form that was filed on August 4, 2006 and the Examiner's failure to grant Applicant's request for a personal interview that was included therein.

In response to the inquiry made by Applicant's representative as to why the Examiner had not acknowledged the Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form that was filed on August

4, 2006, the Examiner indicated that she was not aware that any such Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form had been filed. After Applicant's representative pointed out that the Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form that was filed on August 4, 2006 is available on the USPTO's PAIR system, the Examiner acknowledged that her failure to acknowledge the Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form was an oversight on her part.

During the telephone conference, Applicant's representative expressed Applicant's desire to conduct a personal interview in an effort to gain an understanding of the precise statutory basis of the Examiner's objections to the phrases "tan(1)" and "0.000291," as recited in the pending claims, so that Applicant can formulate an adequate response to these objections. Indeed, Applicant has filed four official responses addressing these objections, without receiving any substantive response to Applicant's arguments with respect to the clarity of these phrases. However, MPEP §707.07(f) requires that "[w]here the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it" (emphasis added).

In response to the request made by Applicant's representative, the Examiner refused to grant Applicant's request for a personal interview, even though the Applicant filed the Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form on August 4, 2006, which was well before the Final Office Action dated October 13, 2006 was mailed.

No exhibits or demonstrations were provided and no amendments were proposed by Applicants' representative.

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**  
**U.S. Application No. 10/787,128**

**Attorney Docket No. Q80097**

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

**It is believed that no petition or fee is required.** However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

/Andrew J. Taska/  
Andrew J. Taska  
Registration No. 54,666

Date: November 22, 2006

